UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/640,627	08/14/2003	Brad Grossman	1875.4580000	8449

26111 7590 08/31/2007
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN, BRANDON S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/640,627	GROSSMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon S. Hoffman	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9-11,13-16 and 18-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9-11,13-16 and 18-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-16, and 18-26 are currently pending in this office action, claims 7, 8, 12, and 17 are newly cancelled.

2. Applicant's arguments, filed June 29, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,694,588).

Regarding claim 11, Ohara et al. teaches a video processing system, comprising:

- A video input interface (fig. 1, ref. num 106);
- A video decoder coupled to said video input interface (fig. 1, ref. num 124);
- A video and graphics processor coupled to said video decoder (fig. 1, ref. num 102);
- A video encoder coupled to said video and graphics processor (fig. 1, ref. num 116); and

- A video output interface coupled to said video encoder, wherein said video encoder includes a timing generator (fig. 1, ref. num 112).

Regarding claim 13, Ohara et al. teaches wherein said video processing system has been implemented on a single integrated circuit (col. 4, lines 3-8).

5. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 14-16, and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohara et al. (USPN '588) in view of Kori (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,094).

Regarding claim 1, Ohara et al. teaches a timing generator for use within a video processing device, comprising:

- A random access memory (col. 5, lines 4-22);
- A plurality of microsequencers coupled to said random access memory that produce flags based on programs stored in said random access memory (col. 4, lines 16-26 and col. 12, lines 36-60); and
- A programmable combinational logic module, coupled to said plurality of microsequencers that generates control signals based on the flags produced by said plurality of microsequencers (col. 13, lines 33-47).

Ohara et al. does not specifically teach **supporting a copy protection process.**

Kori teaches **supporting a copy protection process** (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine **supporting a copy protection process**, as taught by Kori, with the timing generator of Ohara et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because the copy protection process helps prevent copying of video signals (see col. 1, lines 28-63 of Kori).

Regarding claim 2, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches further comprising a plurality of shift registers, coupled to said plurality of microsequencers that provide operating parameters to said plurality of microsequencers (see col. 12, lines 54-60 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 3, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches further comprising a means for downloading software changes to said timing generator while said timing generator is processing a video signal without substantial interference to a video signal being processed (see fig. 10 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches further comprising an instruction set that enables said plurality of microsequencers to share said random access memory (see col. 5, lines 10-16 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 5, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein said plurality of microsequencers includes between two and ten microsequencers (see fig. 14, ref. num 370 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 6, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein said plurality of microsequencers includes seven microsequencers (see fig. 14, ref. num 370 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 9, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein said video processing device is a television (see col. 4, line 27 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 10, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein said video processing device is a cable set-top box (see col. 4, lines 3-26 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 14, Ohara et al. teaches a method for generating a time-dependent control signal for video signals, comprising the steps of:

- Storing a plurality of programs within a random access memory (col. 5, lines 4-22);
- Accessing a plurality of programs stored within the random access memory (col. 7, lines 63-66);
- Executing a set of programs from said plurality of programs by a plurality of microsequencers to generate a set of flags (col. 4, lines 16-26 and col. 12, lines 36-60);
- Generating a control signal based on the set of flags through application of programmable **combinational** logic (col. 13, lines 33-47); and
- Outputting said control signal (fig. 14, ref. num 432).

Ohara et al. does not specifically teach **supporting a copy protection process.**

Kori teaches **supporting a copy protection process** (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine **supporting a copy protection process**, as taught by Kori, with the method of Ohara et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because the copy protection process helps prevent copying of video signals (see col. 1, lines 28-63 of Kori).

Regarding claim 16, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the step of executing is completed in parallel by a plurality of microsequencers (see fig. 14, ref. num 370 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 18, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the control signal is a horizontal sync control signal (see col. 4, lines 38-41 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 19, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the control signal is an external horizontal sync control signal (see col. 4, lines 38-41 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 20, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the control signal is an external vertical sync control signal (see col. 4, lines 38-41 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 21, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the control signal is a vertical blanking active control signal (see col. 6, lines 1-5 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 22, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the control signal is a color burst control signal (see col. 4, lines 38-41 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the control signal is a U Flip control signal/V Flip control signal (see fig. 14 of Kori).

Regarding claim 25, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the control signal is a vertical sync control signal (see col. 4, lines 38-41 of Ohara et al.).

Regarding claim 26, Ohara et al. as modified by Kori teaches wherein the control signal is a vertical blank control signal (see col. 6, lines 1-5 of Ohara et al.).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant amends claims 1, 14, 23, and 24.

7. Applicant argues that Ohara et al. does not teach the video encoder includes a timing generator (see page 11, second paragraph through page 12, second paragraph). Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1 and 14 are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Regarding applicant's argument towards claim 11, examiner disagrees. Column 4, lines 27-44, column 12, lines 36-60 and column 13, lines 33-47 of Ohara et al. teaches the horizontal and vertical sync provide timing to the SVP, which is the video and graphics processor. Additionally, Timing Generators 330 and 332 are supplied to the Instruction Generator 334, which feeds the SVP processor array with a stream of data.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon Hoffman/

BH

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

8/29/07